

Serial No. **10/720,386**

Amendment Dated: November 1, 2006

Reply to Office Action of August 1, 2006

Docket No. **HI-0176**

REMARKS

By the present response, Applicants have submitted new claims 24-27 for consideration by the Examiner and submit that these claims do not contain any prohibited new matter. Applicants have amended claims 1, 11, 18 and 23 to further clarify the invention. Claims 1-27 remain pending in this application. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

In the Office Action, claims 1-9 and 11-23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,038,977 (Cheong et al.). Claim 10 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheong et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,103,344 (Yamamoto).

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections

Claims 1-9 and 11-23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Cheong et al. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Cheong et al. discloses an optical pickup actuator that includes a base having a holder installed at one side thereof, a moving portion in which an objective lens is installed at the periphery thereof and a guide hole is formed, a bobbin coupled to the guide hole, a magnetic driving portion provided at the base and symmetrically arranged to make the moving portion perform focusing and tracking, and suspensions having one end supported at the holder and the

Serial No. 10/720,386

Amendment Dated: November 1, 2006

Docket No. **HI-0176**

Reply to Office Action of August 1, 2006

other end fixed to the moving portion to be connected to the bobbin.

Regarding claims 1, 11, 18 and 23, Applicants submit that Cheong et al. does not disclose, suggest, or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of these claims of, *inter alia*, a mass center position of a lens holder being substantially coincident with a force center position of a driving member, a lens holder comprising a support member to support the driving member between the magnets. The Examiner asserts that Cheong et al. discloses where a mass center portion of the lens holder is substantial coincident with a force center position of the magnetic driving unit, at col. 2, lines 60-64. However, these portions merely disclose that when the tracking coils 15 are at a neutral position, as shown in Fig. 4A, since the magnetic flux is distributed symmetrically with respect to the tracking coils 15, the center of gravity and the center of movement are congruous. This is not mass center position of the lens holder being substantially coincident with a force center position of the driving member, as recited in the claims of the present application. Cheong relates to the center of gravity of the entire actuator and the center of movement of the bobbin being congruous. (see, col. 2, lines 43-49). This is not a mass center position of the lens holder being substantially coincident with a force center position of the driving member. Cheong et al., merely relates to reducing the generation of a pitching mode and a rolling mode (see col. 3, line 34-40). In contrast, embodiments of the present invention relate to an optical pick-up actuator configured to have a consistent mass center position and a force center position of a lens holder.

Serial No. 10/720,386

Amendment Dated: November 1, 2006

Reply to Office Action of August 1, 2006

Docket No. **HI-0176**

Moreover, Applicants submit that Cheong et al. fails to disclose or suggest a tracking coil attached to the focusing coil in series in the tracking direction, as recited in the claims of the present application. The tracking coil of the subject invention has an arrangement in series in the tracking direction, namely Y-direction of the figure 11. In contrast, the tracking coil of Cheong et al. has an arrangement disposed in radius direction regard to the focusing coil 134, namely X-direction of the figure 11. Therefore, Cheong et al. has only an effect to reduce a leakage magnetic flux, without an effect to coincide the mass center position with the force center position.

Additionally, Cheong et al. fails to disclose or suggest a second support member, which is configured to support the driving member (focusing and tracking member) lengthened from the lens holder. The bobbin 125 supporting the coils of Cheong et al., is a dissimilar element with the support member because the element does not prolong from the lens holder. Further, Cheong et al. fails to disclose directly attaching at least one tracking coil to at least one focusing coil to form a driving unit extending along a tracking direction of the lens holder.

Regarding claims 3-17, 20-22 and new claims 24-27, Applicants submit that these claims are dependent on one of independent claims 1, 11, 18 and 23 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding these independent claims. For example, Cheong et al. does not disclose or suggest where the need for a bobbin for fixing the focusing coil or the tracking coil is eliminated. Cheong et al. actually teaches away from these limitations in

Serial No. 10/720,386

Amendment Dated: November 1, 2006

Reply to Office Action of August 1, 2006

Docket No. HI-0176

the claims of the present application in that it clearly discloses the use of a bobbin.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that Cheong et al. does not disclose or suggest the limitations in the combination of each of claims 1, 3-9, 11-18 and 20-23 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Claim 10 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheong et al. in view of Yamamoto. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that claim 10 is dependent on independent claim 1 and, therefore, is patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding this independent claim. Applicants submit that Yamamoto does not overcome the substantial defects noted previously regarding Cheong et al.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of claim 10 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn and that this claim be allowed.

Serial No. 10/720,386

Amendment Dated: November 1, 2006
Reply to Office Action of August 1, 2006

Docket No. HI-0176

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that claims 1-27 are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of such claims is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, Frederick D. Bailey, at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



Daniel Y.J. Kim, Esq.
Registration No. 36,186
Frederick D. Bailey
Registration No. 42,282

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
703 766-3701 DYK/FDB:tlg

Date: November 1, 2006

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610

\\fk4\Documents\2019\2019-179\106991.doc